

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1921.

No. 6.

The Paramount Lesson of Job: God's Glory Magnified by Faith Triumphant over Tribulation.

PROF. J. T. MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

From time immemorial Biblical scholars have been vitally interested in establishing beyond doubt the real purpose, the ultimate design, the one preeminent lesson of "the greatest didactic poem in the world" — the Book of Job. Ever since men have studied the Bible, from the time of the ancient Rabbis, who penned their mysterious glosses, and especially from the time when the first Christian scholar, Ephrem Syrus, Presbyter of Edessa, devoted his attention to the baffling problems of Job, the foremost students of Biblical lore — Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Aben Ezra, Saadia, Cardinal Cajetan, De Pineda, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Luther, Schultens, Rosenmueller, Ewald, Delitzsch, Umbreit, Renan, Froude, and hosts of others, to this writing, have pried into the *locos vexatos* of this wonderful book; and yet, aside from a few obvious facts, we are assured by most eminent men that in the main we still "float upon a sea of conjecture."

It is true, many of the *quaestiones vexatae* refer to problems with which we, in the present discussion, are not concerned. The questions regarding the authorship, canonicity, and integrity of the Book of Job, while intensely important for other considerations, have little bearing upon the subject which shall hold our attention now. For our purpose it is immaterial by whom, at what time, and in what manner the book was composed, though we personally incline to the view that it is the oldest book in the Bible, and that it was written either by Job himself or by Elihu. However, be that as it may. The question before us is whether there is in the book a single great lesson, which the author desired to teach, and if so, what this paramount lesson may be.

That some special design was in the mind of the writer is obvious from the absolute unity and harmony that prevail through-

out the entire book. This single fact is sufficient to demolish the theory of Duhm, according to which the prose prolog and epilog are surviving fragments of a "Volksbuch" or popular story of a comparatively early date; while the intervening poetical speeches are attributed to a much later age because they are thought to reflect a very different point of view from that of the Volksbuch. In confutation of this theory we desire to point out that this would absolutely destroy the unity of the plot, which is most carefully elaborated, not only with regard to the content, but also with regard to the mechanical arrangement. Manifestly the whole book is a unit, was originally conceived as a unit, and carried out upon the basis of one great scheme or design. This is clear from the tripartite division, which obtains everywhere. There is a prolog, followed by the main body, consisting of three main parts, and the book closes with an epilog, which corresponds to the prolog, and is logically developed from the content of the poetical portion. A brief survey of the book gives us the following outline, which at once demonstrates the unity of plot, harmony of impression, and singleness of design.

I. PROLOG: SCENE, SETTING, PLOT. Chaps. 1. 2.

II. THE MAIN BODY, CONSISTING OF DISCOURSES.

Chaps. 3—42, 6.

- 1) *Discourses between Job and his friends*, chaps. 3—31.
 - a) First set of dialogs, chaps. 3—14.
 - b) Second set of dialogs, chaps. 15—21.
 - c) Third set of dialogs, chaps. 22—31.
- 2) *Discourse of Elihu*, chaps. 32—37.
- 3) *Discourse of Jehovah*, chaps. 38—41.
- 4) *Job's confessional discourse*, chap. 42, 1—6.

III. THE EPILOG. Chap. 42, 7—16.

In determining the lesson which the author meant to teach in his great didactic poem, we fear that, in the past, too little attention has been given to the germ thoughts, and explanatory suggestions offered in the prolog. The prolog, much as in any other great poem or drama, really and extensively explains the circumstances under which the subsequent dialogs take place, and thus shows, even in so many expressed words, the object of the whole book. Here we find, first of all, an accurate delineation of the character of Job, who is the central figure also in the poetical portion, and of whom, too, the author speaks in the closing sentence

of the epilog. Without this character delineation we should not understand either Job's conduct or his words under the great trials which were inflicted upon him. "That man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil." 1, 2. The multiplication of synonyms is remarkable. Emphasis rests upon the fact that Job is a true believer (*vireh elohim, theosebaes*), who holds to his integrity (*machasik betumato*). This last sentence is supremely vital, as it is, according to our view, the keynote to the whole book. Of him God Himself declares that "there is none like him in the earth." V. 8. This assertion is again made by God in the epilog, though in different words: "Ye have not spoken of Me the thing that is right, as *My servant Job hath.*" 42, 7.

Accordingly, the one great thing which the author wishes to stress is Job's *faith*. That faith Satan calls into doubt. For that faith Satan claims a selfish motive. The question which he tauntingly puts to God is: "Doth Job fear God for naught?" V. 9. And he charges Him: "Put forth Thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse Thee (renounce Thee) to Thy face." V. 11. Here we have the real clue to that mysterious portion which constitutes the main part of the book. The real question is not as to *why* the good must suffer. That problem is already solved in the prolog. The *source whence* suffering comes is clearly stated, for it is Satan who is the cause of a Christian's affliction. In the end, however, it is God who afflicts ("Put forth *Thine* hand and touch him." V. 11). The *purpose* of a Christian's suffering is to try his faith, so that God's glory, who is the Author of faith, may be vindicated. The *consolatory lesson* we may express in the words of the Apostle, that all things must work together for good to those that love God.

Such, then, we believe, is the true situation that obtains throughout the book. Job, the upright, devout believer, is to be tried as regards his faith. Satan has claimed that this faith rests upon selfish motives and that it cannot prevail if these motives be removed. The Lord stakes His glory in the preservation of Job's faith, and grants Satan permission to divest Job of everything that Satan thinks might preserve or foster faith, and in addition to assail his faith in the fiercest manner. So the real issue is between the Lord and Satan, the conflict turning about God's glory. If the faith of Job can be kept under the most trying circumstances, then the power, grace, and mercy of God are vindicated. That is, as we see it, the real problem of the Book of Job,

and accordingly, the paramount lesson: *God's Glory Magnified by Faith Triumphant over Tribulation.*

From this point of view we shall now examine into the dialogs, which have ever baffled the minds of men. The poetical part of the poem is the essential one, the true battle-ground where Satan cunningly, but vehemently makes war upon God's saint. He has already stripped him of every earthly prosperity, of his property, his numerous offspring, the delight of Job's heart, and has reduced him to unparalleled wretchedness. In these afflictions Job's faith has come out triumphant. His answer to the rude deprivation of everything dear to his heart was: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave, and the Lord (Jehovah, the God of grace) hath taken away; *blessed be the name of the Lord.*" 1, 21. And so the Lord Himself puts upon his behavior the seal of divine approval in the face of Satan's sarcastic taunt: "In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God with foolishness." 1, 22.

The first trial over, Satan again, by special permission of the Lord, torments Job. This time his assaults are still more furious. The Lord, having through Job gained the victory over the Evil One, had boasted: "He still holdeth fast his integrity (*machasik betumato* — his faith in God), although thou movedst Me against him to destroy him without a cause." 2, 3. Upon this Satan suggests: "Put forth Thy hand now and touch his *bone* and his *flesh*, and he will *renounce Thee to Thy face*" (will renounce his faith in Thee). 2, 5. However, even now, though smitten from the sole of his foot unto his crown with the most dreadful form of leprosy, elephantiasis, and tempted by his own wife to renounce God and die, Job keeps the faith. "He did not sin with his lips." 2, 10.

"Here," the *Pulpit Commentary* says, "the narrative might have ended, Satan being baffled, Job's character (faith) vindicated, and the real existence of true and disinterested piety having been irrefragably manifested and proved"; also, we may add, God's glory having been magnified.

However, when the Lord had said: "Behold, he is in thy hand; only spare his life," 2, 6, He had yielded to Satan not only Job's *body*, but also his *soul*. Hence the following chapters which constitute the body of the book do not introduce a *new, foreign* element, but present the actual battle-ground, upon which the decisive battle was fought. The attacks upon Job were no longer physical, but spiritual. It was no longer brute force that Satan employed,

but clever cunning. Satan no longer presented himself as a *deadly foe*, but as a helpful, sympathetic friend. It is remarkable that, with the close of the prolog, Satan should at once disappear from the scene. In reality, however, Satan was there, all through the unspeakable horrors that darkened Job's believing soul, directing his attacks through the three "comforters," Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar. The fact that these three men are introduced already in the prolog, which, as we have already shown, presents and unravels the whole plot of the narrative, proves that the three friends of Job *are sent by Satan* to serve his purpose of destroying Job's faith.

However, that does not mean that we condemn these men as *manifestly wicked* and as *willingly serving* Satan's purposes. From their discourses we gather that they were God-fearing men. They had a fair knowledge of good and evil, of repentance and faith. Yet they err by a *wrong application of the Word of God*. A false application and division of Law and Gospel is always apt to work disastrous results. So also here. The result of their condemnations was that Job was only led farther away from God, and induced to make statements truly rebellious to the Lord.

For a scholar sitting in his easy-chair it is a comparatively simple matter to contemplate Job's suffering, and pass judgment upon his conduct. For Job the situation was dreadful. To him it was evident that God had turned against him. He could not think otherwise but that God had inflicted upon him all the terrors of hell, which in a short time was to be his. And yet, he, too, longed for *Sheol*, for his torments were beyond description. Never, outside of Gethsemane, does Scripture present to us a man so furiously assailed by Satan, both in body and mind. Viewed from the magnitude of Job's bodily suffering, the agony of his soul must have been monumental. We cannot picture it to us as we can picture the loathsome, leprous, writhing form of his wasted body, since mortal eye cannot vision the soul. However, the struggle must have been unparalleled. And yet, throughout that excruciating torment of spiritual conflicts Job *maintains the victory*. He curses the day of his birth, and in deep moments of despondency, caused largely by the chiding remonstrance of his "comforters," he even challenges God to show His justice, prove His mercy, and reveal to him the reason for his suffering, yet he *never renounces God, never gives up faith*, never ceases to regard God as His Redeemer and Salvation. The wrong words, which Job spoke about God, were mainly provoked by his friends' misapplied rebukes, yet

not even their harshest criticisms could move him to say a single word essentially contrary to his faith.

That under these circumstances Job's faith should gain the victory was an infallible proof of God's power, grace, and love, and thus over against Satan, with regard to Job himself, and also with regard to his "comforters" that tribulation redounded to God's glory. Job was a firmer believer for the trials he had passed through, his friends were wiser for having witnessed them, and God's sovereignty, majesty, grace, and compassion stand out in clearer contrast for having maintained the faith of His saint. To this day no Christian reader can lay away the Book of Job without having gained from it a clearer understanding of God's ways with His saints, a mighty strengthening of his faith in affliction, and lastly, a greater and deeper reverence for the Lord, whose loving-kindness upholds us, and whose tender mercies shine through the very chastisements which He allots to us for His glory and our own greater good.

Having laid down these guiding principles, we shall not reduce the reader's pleasure of private application, by illustrating for him how, in the various instances, the discourses bear out what has been said. We wish to add only a few remarks, as a further help to the reader to find his way through the maze of heterogeneous dialog. In the first dialog (chaps. 3—14) we are at once introduced to the mode of argumentation employed by Job's friends. Essentially there is no difference between their points of view. Having heard the woeful curse which Job pronounced upon the day of his birth, they are all three led to believe that Job's calamities have come upon him from God's hand as a condign punishment for sins that he had committed, and of which he had not repented. As the discussion advances, their charges are reiterated time and again by each in turn, Eliphaz being the most dignified, Bildad the most blunt, and Zophar the most rude. Very discourteously they maintain his glaring guilt, and see in Job's attempt at defense only a confirmation of the correctness of their diagnosis, expressing at the same time their conviction that he is a hardened-in-guilt, irrecoverable reprobate (4, 8; 5, 8; 8, 5; 11, 8. 20). While these charges may appear plausible, as a reason for his suffering, they are in reality a misapplication of God's Word, and tended to destroy Job's faith altogether. What a Christian needs in the hour of trial is not the denunciation of the Law, but the helping, healing, guiding comfort of the Gospel. The casuistry of the three "comforters"

was not evangelical, but papistical. Their advice was much like that given to Luther when, under the weight of affliction, he yearned for comfort. To speak words of condemnation to a believer, writhing under the agony of trial, is not "*speaking that of God which is right,*" is not serving him in God's place, but the devil's. Then, too, Christ has commanded us *not* to see in a particular chastisement a *special punishment* for particularly gross sins. Sinners, especially tried, are not to be regarded as sinners *above others*. John 9, 1—3. That was exactly the charge which the three friends preferred against Job, and in this they "spake of God that which is not right." Against these charges Job protests his innocence. He readily admits, it is true, iniquities of his youth (13, 26), and pleads guilty of frequent sins of infirmity (7, 20, 21; 10, 14; 13, 23; 14, 16). Yet he insists that he is not wicked (10, 7) and calls upon God to confirm this. It cannot be denied that some of the very expressions of Job, in which he asserts his innocency, are wicked. He permits himself to be drawn into statements with regard to God's indifference to moral good and evil (8, 22—24), which are both incautious and presumptuous, while he manifestly taxes God with injustice towards himself (3, 20—26; 7, 12—21; 9, 30—35). It is just such statements as these for which God afterwards rebukes him, and of which he repents in dust and ashes. But we also notice that this is the *very design of Satan* in charging Job, through his friends, with God's wrath upon his sins. Evidently, as we may infer from the whole series of dialogs, it was his purpose to say something at which Job might be scandalized to renounce God. That object must always be kept in mind. — However, throughout the whole first set of dialogs — and in these we see Job at his weakest, while the onslaughts of Satan are fiercest — the great sufferer in no way curses God or ceases to trust in Him. He is ever confident that in some way or other, and at some time or other, his own innocence will be established, and God's justice manifested. Meanwhile, he continually keeps a firm hold on God, and again and again turns to Him for deliverance. That was the *essence* of Job's faith, as it is that of every true faith. What Job fought against with might and main was the effort of his friends to *darken his vision of God as a loving friend*. As a friend Job often rebukes God, but God never ceases, in his mind, *to be his friend*. As a friend, Job thinks, God is dealing cruelly with him, but none the less, *God remains his friend*, though he cannot see the reason why this divine Friend should so turn against him.

As we carefully study each set of dialogs, we shall find that each apology of Job is arranged in *pyramidal form*. Out of the depth of despair Job's faith rises to dazzling heights, to be cast down again into bottomless pits of despondency. In the first dialog the pyramidal height is found in chap. 13, 7. Job had impatiently repudiated the charge of his friends that his calamity is a direct punishment of a God who is angry with him because of his sins. "Will ye speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for Him?" he asks, with a wonderful display of right understanding. And then his faith rises to ethereal heights as he cries out, in heroic faith: "*Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him. He also shall be my salvation; for a hypocrite cannot come before Him.*" 13, 15, 16. In these words Job clearly shows how he regards his three comforters. They are not *friends*, but in reality *emissaries of Satan*, to cause him to relinquish his hold on God. It is this consideration which no doubt moves him again and again to hurl against them those harsh epithets of defiance, much as Luther did against the Pope for the same reason. By presenting God to him as an angry judge, they could not help but instil into his soul thoughts of terror and despair, where already terror held sway. Against that spirit of terror Job's faith struggles, as now he suddenly rises over it, and again is suddenly drawn down into it. This becomes clearer still as we consider the next dialog, chaps. 15—21.

The second set of dialogs is noted for greater vehemence. The disputants have now become impetuous, and their language is often coarse. Eliphaz (15, 1—6) begins by charging Job with every manner of gross rebellion against God — presumption, impiety, arrogance, and by emphasizing that such wickedness is always punished in this life with utmost severity (15, 17—35). Bildad follows with a violent series of denunciations and threats, assuming the guilt of Job as proved, and maintaining that the calamity which has befallen him is no less than what he has actually deserved (chap. 18). Zophar reechoes Bildad's denunciations, and threatens Job with even greater ills (chap. 20). Thus the battle rages on furiously and perpetually, and little progress is made on both sides. This is psychologically correct. So, in the struggle which Satan inflicts upon a Christian's soul, there is a constant wavering to and fro, until the hour of trial is over. So, also, Satan again and again repeats the charges of a man's reprobation and God's consequent vehement wrath. Every Christian who has passed through the valley of fierce spiritual affliction will confirm this, and this is the

strongest reason why we believe that Job himself must have written the book. He alone could adequately depict the fierceness of his agony with such absolute psychological truth. — Job again answers the charges made against him (chaps. 16, 17, 19, 21). At first we see him writhing in the lowest depths of despair. Out of his misery and pitiful wretchedness his soul rises up against God, not to curse Him, but to wrest from Him a word of explanation. However, gradually his faith becomes stronger. God is *his friend still*, though he chides this divine Friend for His *severity* (chaps. 16, 17). Yet out of this very struggle his faith rises mountain-high to the portals of heaven, and thus again we find in chap. 19, 23—26 the summit of faith's pyramid, — words which have since reechoed through the vistas of ages: "*For I know that my Avenger liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God*" (note the mountain of faith in the one little word "see"), "*whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.*" This is Job's defiance of Satan whose vicious attacks he espies in the charges of his "comforters." The faith of Job here shows a marvelous development; for the light that shines from the top of this pyramid is much clearer than that before. Job knows God as his Redeemer, his Avenger (Goel), who will not "slay him," but who will stand victoriously upon his grave claiming Job as one of His own. And then His eyes shall behold Him, shall see the why and the wherefore of his suffering. Surely, a most marvelous expression of utmost faith. However, immediately afterwards Satan casts the saint into the abysmal gorge of utter despondency (21, 7—33), and he avers that God, His Redeemer, smiles upon the wicked, and distributes good and evil without a discoverably just principle of equity.

The third dialog begins with chapter 22 and ends with chapter 31. Zophar is silent, and the discourse is confined to Job, Eliphaz, and Bildad. Eliphaz clearly misunderstands Job's plea that he is innocent, and shows that God is not profited by man's goodness (chap. 22), in consequence of which God owes man nothing, not even the explanation of His action. Once more he violently asserts Job's extreme wickedness (22, 5) and urges him to repent (22, 23—30), promising that God would then be gracious unto him. Eliphaz is hopelessly ensnared in his wrong diagnosis, and despairs of advising his friend. Bildad, too, speaks of man's weakness, littleness, and sinfulness (chap. 25), all of which he

ascribes to Job, urging him to change his ways. In his reply Job shows himself utterly disgusted at his friends, turns to God (chap. 23), requests of Him to prove his innocence (23, 10—17), pictures the extreme wickedness of the impious (chap. 24), to whom he surely cannot belong. He, too, retracts his former statements in which he asserted that God is indifferent to the evils of the corrupt (24, 24). "They are punished and brought low." In his answer to Bildad Job asserts God's sovereignty, greatness, and inscrutableness (chap. 26), and again expresses faith in God. In chap. 27, 6 we have the third pinnacle of Job's pyramidal faith. "*My righteousness,*" he declares, "*I hold fast and will not let it go. For what is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul?*" Such faith in God, combined with true fear of Him, is the true wisdom, the only source of comfort in his affliction (chap. 28). Comforted and sustained by the knowledge that God directs all things wisely, he regretfully reviews his happy past, when his faith was bright and strong (29, 2—4), and contrasts it with his present wretchedness (chap. 30). In chapter 31 Job's hopeful outlook is again changed into profound depression; the soul lifted up in strengthening trust is hurled down to the bottom of helplessness (chap. 31). And then his lips are silent. He *cannot* speak, for he feels that his speech is full of sin. Silently he grasps the comfort which his faith holds out, having resigned himself to God. No onslaughts of Satan, no charges of his friends that he is guilty and suffering at the hands of an angry God, yea, that God has cut him off, no seeming prosperity of the wicked, no apparent injustice to the pious, nothing can shake his faith. There are three beacon lights that shine into the gloom of his trials: 1) "*Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him*" (13, 15); 2) "*I know that my Redeemer liveth*" (19, 25—27); 3) "*My righteousness I hold fast and will not let it go*" (27, 6). Job has spoken sinfully against the dispensation of an inscrutable Providence, has spoken of God's injustice, His cruelty, His indifference towards the pious in their affliction, His disregard for the sins of the wicked, but *so far as his faith is concerned*, "he did not speak evil with his lips." He chode his divine Friend, but yet he maintained that God is *his Friend*. For such faith God finally commends him.

Job and his friends being silent, Elihu appears on the scene. He has heard all the colloquies, and is dissatisfied with both Job and his friends. Elihu is usually regarded as arrogant and con-

ceited, and his words are interpreted as cant and hypocrisy. Yet there is one important fact which commends his discourse to our earnest consideration. While the Lord rebukes the three friends, charging them with having spoken of Him that which is not right, He does not rebuke Elihu, but acquiesces in what he has said. Also Job silently submits to Elihu, and acknowledges the truth of his reproof. Elihu's arguments are noted for clearness, independence of thought, deep wisdom, just moderation, and, withal, true piety. His discourse carries us through chapters 32—37. He is angry with his friends for not having silenced Job's contentious striving with God (chap. 32). Clearly and logically he shows Job where he has erred (33, 9. 10). God has *not become his enemy* as Job imagines; for God sends affliction, not to punish, but to chasten, not in wrath, but in love (33, 12—33). Moreover, Elihu points out to Job that God is not unjust (34, 12). "Surely," he says, "God *will not do wickedly*, neither will the Almighty pervert judgment." In the third place, Elihu rebukes Job's lack of faith, expressed in the words, "What profit shall I have if I be cleansed from my sin?" and directs him to trust in the Lord (35, 14). In chapters 36 and 37 Elihu summarizes the whole situation, showing how God in all His works is perfectly righteous, chastising, but delivering (36, 8—15), wherefore Job should not have passed judgment upon Him or desired death (36, 16—21). Rather should he, in his distress, have magnified the Lord, as all the creatures of God do that wait upon the Lord (36, 22. 23). For God's work is great and past finding out (chap. 37). So all men should acknowledge Him, and fear Him in true humility (37, 24).

We thus see that Elihu censures those very sins which in the heat of affliction Job had committed with his mouth — sins of murmuring against God's wonderful dispensation. Clearly and forcibly Elihu directs Job to the right path, by proving to him that punishment is not always punitive, but, in the case of God's people, disciplinary, that it is not penalty, but chastening. Silently Elihu therefore commends Job's faith, and this faith the Lord Himself emphasizes, as His best worship and service, by revealing to Job the magnitude of His works. These works show God's great *power*, but also His *mercy* (38, 41). All the beasts of the field turn to Him in their manifold needs, and find in Him a willing Helper (chap. 39). Hence God is not indifferent as regards His works, but *wisely*, *powerfully*, and *lovingly* ordains all things. So Job should not have charged Him with unfairness, negligence, and cruelty, longing for death as the termination of all evil.

Job readily repents of the wrong which his lips have spoken. He pleads guilty of having spoken that which he does not understand (40, 4. 5). Upon this God once more asserts His justice (40, 10—12), for He brings low the wicked (40, 12), just as He controls and keeps under subjection Behemoth and Leviathan (41, 34), the children of pride, symbols of the wicked and ungodly. Job now humbles himself again, and repents in dust and ashes (42, 1—6), whereupon God restores to him doubly all that which he had lost. This itself is God's own proof that He had not rejected His saint, but that Job, by holding to Him in faith, had in reality gained the victory. However, God, in addition, declares that Job *has spoken of Him that which was right*, and unqualifiedly acknowledges him as *His servant* (42, 7), whereas the three comforters of Job are said not to have spoken that which was right.

The last statements of God we can understand only if we bear in mind that they refer to Job's expression of faith. As Elihu had done, so the Lord censured Job's words of rebellion against the Lord's justice, mercy, and gracious dispensation. However, in the main Job spoke that which was right. Clinging to God, holding to Him in his deepest affliction, his faith prevailed even over his own doubts, and led him in the end willingly to repent of what wrong he had declared. This faith of Job made him whole.

Viewed in this light, the entire Book of Job lies open before us, with a vision of light clearer than day. Incidentally we are given the reason why also Christians must suffer. Yet the main lesson is of vaster import. Job is an example of true faith (Ezek. 14, 14), who ranks with Noah and Daniel, men who have kept the faith amid universal defection from God. With Ewald we are inclined to interpret his name as "One-turned-to-God," for throughout his deep affliction he keeps his eyes directed to the Lord, his Redeemer. Whence the afflictions came, he did not see, as we see it now, from the light which the prolog sheds upon the entire book. That Satan, the accuser of men (2 Cor. 2, 11; 12, 7), demanded a trial of his faith, and that God permitted this in order to magnify His own glory, he did not know. Nor was he conscious of the fact that by this very trial Satan essayed to destroy his faith, and that to this end he put into Job's mouth the offensive words of reasoning and murmuring. Yet Job kept the faith, though in the fire of affliction his soul was sorely tried, and his mouth uttered things that were "too wonderful for him."

The lesson is ever valuable to every sincere saint of God. So God to this day permits Satan to buffet His children, that their

faith may be tried, their hope strengthened, and their love to God rendered pure. Job was a truer Christian for having passed through the affliction, and so the faith of God's children becomes purer than gold only through the fire of trials and crosses. Hence it is not for us to murmur at the burden which God, for our own good and for the manifestation of His glory, imposes for a while, but patiently to bear it, until the blessed hour of God's deliverance shall have come; nor are we to doubt God's justice in thus afflicting us, and stumble at the apparent happiness and security of the unbelieving children of the world, whose doom is fixed, and who are beyond correction. True, the burdens often seem unbearably heavy; but they are not too heavy for the Christian to bear (1 Cor. 10, 13), and faith often grows strongest as the burthen is heaviest (chap. 19, 25—27). With us, too, will be found the "comforters" who misinterpret our sufferings, who, instead of strengthening our faith by properly applying the Word of God, weaken it by misapplication. In the end, however, the Lord will send us an Elihu to correct our erring minds, and lead us upon the right path, until God Himself, knowing our feebleness of understanding, will interpret to us His wonderful ways, showing Himself as the all-powerful, all-merciful, and ever-ready Helper, whose love is at all times supporting us. So days of rejoicing will follow the hours of affliction, and in the end we shall see that "all things work together for good to them that love God."

Thus we would interpret this wonderful book, its main purpose and paramount lesson; a book rich in piety, instruction, and true consolation; a book that strengthens our faith, increases our patience, and renews our hope in our precious Redeemer.

Why the Name Lutheran.¹⁾

I. WHAT JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS NAME?

We have not hesitated to call our periodical the *Lutheran* (*Der Lutheraner*). We do, however, feel it to be our duty to answer those who may inquire what significance it has and what justification we have in adopting it.

We know full well that from the very beginning not a few

1) The suggestion made in footnote 9, page 6, of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY has induced Rev. Carl Romoser, of Granite City, Ill., to offer this reproduction of Dr. Walther's article in Vol. I, No. 1, of *Der Lutheraner*.

have taken offense because the Lutheran Church is named after Luther — after a mere man. This name clearly evidences, they declare, that this Church cannot be the true Church of Jesus Christ, but is only the fabrication of a man, and, say they, such churches are sectarian. "Lutherans," they urge, "by all means read the opinion of St. Paul concerning human names in 1 Cor. 1. 3. Are you not guilty, when you designate yourselves Lutherans, of the very evil Paul condemns?" Not a few Lutherans are at a loss what to reply when opponents make this charge. But plausible as this rebuke appears, on closer inspection it becomes just as much without justification and foundation as it seemed plausible. In the first place, it is a mistake to say that Lutherans first called themselves by this name. History clearly testifies that enemies, in order to revile, first designated them as Lutherans.

Dr. Eck, who held the famous Leipzig debate with Luther, first referred to those who supported Luther's teachings as Lutherans. Luther's opinion about this is clearly stated in one of his writings in 1522, *Admonition against Rioting*. Among other things he wrote: "I beg not to have my name mentioned, and to call the people, not Lutheran, but Christian. What is Luther? The doctrine is not mine, nor have I been crucified for any one. St. Paul (1 Cor. 3, 4. 5) would not suffer Christians to be called after Peter, but only after Christ. Why should I — miserable piece of corruption that I am — have this honor, that the children of Christ should be called after my abominable name? No, no, my dear friends; let us abolish party names and be called Christians after Christ, whose doctrine we have. The papists deserve to have a party name, for they are not content with the doctrine and name of Christ; they want to be popists also. Well, let them be called popish, for the Pope is their master. I am not, and do not want to be, anybody's master. I share with the Church the one common doctrine of Christ, who alone is our Master. Matt. 23, 8." (St. L. Ed. 10, 370.) This appeal of Luther clearly indicates his strong position, and refutes the charge that he ambitiously desired his followers to call themselves Lutherans.

We dare not maintain, however, that it is not permitted for Christians to call themselves after a man. We have an incontestable example of this very thing in the Old Testament Church, where God Himself called the Church after a man. Is it not called the Israelitic Church? Christ calls it such when speaking of Nathanael: "Behold an Israelite in whom there is no guile." And

was not Israel a man? Consequently, it depends upon the sense in which children of God call themselves after a man. In that respect only can there possibly be sin. Now, in what sense and for what reason did the Corinthians call themselves after Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ? This was done, we read, that they might separate themselves one from the other. Although Paul, Apollos, and Peter (Cephas) preached the same truth, the Corinthians rejected the one when they received the other. By such designations they declared themselves separate, and thus created factions. The sin that Paul reproves was that they were causing divisions among those who held one and the same faith, and not that they called themselves after these men. Therefore the Apostle rejected even the name Christian which some insisted upon bearing because they used it in this sectarian sense. Even the name Christ, though not a man's, could not be used in this sectarian way. True Lutherans have never called themselves in this objectionable sense after Luther. With this name they have never distinguished and separated themselves from the orthodox teachers. They professed themselves just as much followers of Augustine and all other pure teachers of the Gospel of all times and places. Luther never considered himself the only true teacher. He wrote publicly concerning his contemporary, the Wuertemberg theologian Brenz: "I esteem your works so highly that I consider mine absolutely worthless when compared with yours and such as yours. And rest assured, I do not speak fables, nor utter anything offensive. Indeed, I do not praise Brenz, but the spirit in you which is so much kinder, friendlier, and more peaceable than mine." Indeed, no man speaks like this when he desires to become the head of a sect. Much more does this sound like the Lutheran who desired to be nothing more than a witness of the truth. Neither do we call ourselves Lutherans in the sense in which we call ourselves Christians. We are not Lutherans because we believe and trust in Luther. Highly as we esteem this mighty instrument of our God, we accept not a word in matters of faith just because Luther spoke it, but only when it is founded on the written Word of God. We do not recognize him as an apostle or prophet. We know that he was highly enlightened, but also that he was, like other men, subject to sin. He is not the head of our Church; he is not our pope. All who accept, in blind faith, all that Luther said, simply because he said it, are as far from true Lutheranism as the earth is from the sky and the night from the day. Luther wrote to Melancthon,

who was attending the Augsburg Diet in 1530: "It displeases me much when you write in your letter that you have followed me in this matter because of my reputation. I desire no reputation and will not command nor be known as a founder. And even though men immediately put a proper construction upon it, I will not have it. If the matter is also yours and affects you even as much as me, it should not be spoken of as mine." Luther rejected unlawful reputation in the Church, and our Church has never ascribed such reputation to him. We read in the very beginning of the Formula of Concord, one of the most important confessions of orthodox Lutherans: "We believe, teach, and confess that the only real standard according to which at once all dogma and teachers should be esteemed and judged is nothing less than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Other writings of ancient and modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them and should not be received other or further than as witnesses, in what manner and in what place, since the time of the apostles, the (pure) doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved."

Finally, the question might be asked whether we call ourselves Lutheran in order to emphasize that we cling to a new doctrine promulgated by Luther some three hundred years ago,²⁾ or at least desire to adhere to a new church established by him. God forbid! We refuse to be known as Lutherans in the sense in which the followers of Arius, for instance, are called Arians, or the Dominicans after Dominic. Luther preached no new doctrine, but restated the pristine doctrine of the eternal Gospel. Neither did he separate himself from the old true Church, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Cornerstone. He separated himself from, or rather was forced out of, the communion of those who had fallen from the old faith and were misusing the name of the old Catholic Church to enslave men's consciences by their traditions. The purpose of this periodical is to testify to these truths. We shall, in the first place, call attention to a few of Luther's declarations that clearly prove he was not determined upon spreading his own opinions, but insisted only on publishing God's Word. He writes at the end of his excellent postil: "Would to God that all expositions of mine and other teachers might perish, and every Christian would concern himself

2) Written 1844.

only with the Scriptures, the pure Word of God! You can see yourself from my idle talk how immeasurably superior God's Word is to man's. Yes, no man's words can approach, nor compare with, those of the Lord. He who is able, without commentaries and expositions, to satisfy himself will find no use for mine or other men's commentaries. They would only hinder him. Therefore, dear Christian, read the Scriptures, search the Scriptures, and let mine and other expositions be only scaffolds to the real building, whereby you seize, enjoy, and abide in, the pure Word of God. For there God dwells in Zion." Luther's bitterest enemies must acknowledge that his position was thoroughly based upon the Scriptures. For this very reason he spread them among the people. In confirmation of this let us quote from the writing of a certain Roman Catholic author, Floremundus Raemundus. This man wrote with particular violence against the Protestants and took active part in the persecutions against them. But hear him in his *History of the Origin, etc., of the Heretics of the Sixteenth Century*: "The common people everywhere lived with the Bible (at Luther's time). It had been translated into the mother tongue. One saw the book on all shelves and tables. It was in the craftsman's shop and on the mother's lap. The whole world was engaged in the reading of the Bible. These sectarians, armed with this book, upon meeting a priest or monk, began to argue with him. They insisted upon being shown where the mass was found in the Holy Scriptures. Others demanded proof for the doctrine of purgatory, infant baptism, and the Trinity. Finally, they demanded that every doctrine be proved with exact words. They rejected all traditions and apostolic ordinances; for the arch-heretic had taught: 'The Bible, which is committed to all, is the only standard in all controversies in religion.'" Could any one give a more vivid picture of the growth of a new life in the Reformation-days through the Bible? Who could better defend Luther against the charge that he established a new religion? We let Luther answer whether he despised the true Church and desired to establish a new one. In 1532 he wrote "Against Factious Spirits" (these writings were directed chiefly against the Zwinglians, who denied the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament). He says: "I would rather have, not only the factious spirits, but the wisdom and law of all emperors, kings, and princes bear witness against me, than the least testimony of the Christian Church. For we dare not deal lightly with articles of faith, harmoniously held since

apostolic days, as we would with papistical and imperial laws or other traditions of the fathers and councils." These words are convincing proof that Luther did not despise the Church, as has often been charged against him. He desired to be its obedient son. He was, indeed, no respecter of persons, and yet he never desired, as so many to-day, to stand, in a false way, upon his own conceited self-sufficiency. He maintained that the true Church had existed throughout the centuries. His inquiry, above all, was how she had taught throughout the centuries. He honored, indeed, the voice of the true Church and desired to be in agreement with her; he looked upon her as the pillar and stronghold of the truth, and wished to be a member of the great army of orthodox teachers from the apostles' time down to his own. Never did he deny the duty of hearing and obeying the Church. Matt. 18, 17. Therefore, this is not the point of dispute that once engaged the Lutheran and Catholic churches and still does to-day. The question is not whether man must obey the Church when she legitimately demands it (for she can justly demand such obedience), but whether man must obey her when she commands that which is contrary to the Gospel. Such obedience Luther denied her, and declared that when the voice of Christ is not heard, the Bride, His true Church, must not be heard. He condemned false prophets who bear the name of the Church as a cloak, and hide themselves in it, as ravening wolves. And finally, he separated himself from these false prophets, since they would not permit a reformation. But this act did not separate him from the true Church.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Disintegration in the State Church of Norway.

The Lutheran (March 24) says:—

"An editorial in a recent number of *Skandinaven* presents a summary of the condition of the Church in Norway. The editorial is based upon an article which appeared in a paper published in Norway. As in other countries of Europe, church affairs are in a very unsettled condition. The laxity of the state church in doctrine and practise for the last half century or more has opened the door for the sects. These have separated from the state church. There were also Lutherans who have been dissatisfied with the state church and have withdrawn from it. All these parties are called 'free churches.' The state church is divided into factions which are as bitterly opposed to one another as are the free churches to the state church.

"The year 1920 has been one of unusual controversy among the different parties. A convention of the clergy of the state church at Drammen and a similar convention of the representatives of the free churches at Calmeyer [Calmar?], have not improved matters, but, if anything, made them worse. The public press has become interested and is participating in the discussions."

"It is strange what efforts are made on the part of the liberals and unbelievers to get rid of the thought of condemnation. They seem to think that if they could get rid of the thought, they might escape the real thing. Last fall there was an ecclesiastical convention of the clergy of Sweden in Stockholm. Among other things which showed the liberalism which still prevails in some parts of the country, a resolution was considered to discard entirely the Athanasian Creed, as also to strike out of the confession the words, 'a lost and condemned creature.' Even one or more of the bishops were in favor of the resolution and spoke for its adoption. The matter was finally settled by a sort of compromise."

If the matter was "settled" as related, it means that the diplomats who did the settling will discover what all diplomats discover sooner or later, *viz.*, that they have settled nothing except the amount of chloroform it required to put their own conscience to sleep. D.

Among the Swedish Lutherans.

The Swedish Augustana Synod is discussing a new constitution which is proposed for adoption. A running criticism, in Swedish, is offered by H. P. in *Augustana* for May 5, and the *Lutheran Companion* of May 7 writes editorially on the issue, pleading chiefly for unification and centralization of the Synod's educational and mission-work. On one of the proposed changes the writer says: "When it comes to the ordination of pastors, why should we continue the time-honored practise of ordaining these men only upon the examination and decision of the Ministerium, when we are the only Lutheran body in America that follows this method of procedure? Why not have the conferences have this responsibility? Let them appoint an examining committee of five or more pastors, and then, on their recommendation, let the conference president ordain those who have applied, in the churches which they are to serve. If the editor is correctly informed, this is the method followed in the United Lutheran Church. To all intents and purposes the conferences of our Synod are now distinct synods. Most of them are incorporated as self-governing bodies. They own and control one or more institutions, and the power to discipline churches and pastors is in their hands. When they have the right to receive churches into the Synod, why should they not also have the right to receive pastors? To the editor's way of thinking, the change suggested for the examining of candidates for ordination is the least satisfactory of all. He can see no valid reason why the theological faculty should be on this examining committee at all. After the faculty has given the candidates their certificate of standing and recommended them to the Synod, or conferences, as the case may be,

this should be sufficient. If we are to change the mode of procedure at all, let us make it more simple than it is at present. The plan suggested would not be a safeguard any more than is the present method, and it is apparent to a close observer that the appeals to Synod would be numerous in the future, if the plan were adopted." In the Missouri Synod the congregations have delegated the right to determine the theological fitness of an applicant for the ministry to their theological faculties, or for extraordinary cases (such as have not received their theological training at the Synod's seminaries) to standing examining boards. The right to order the ordination of a candidate who has accepted a call to serve a congregation, or mission, the congregations have delegated to the presidents of District synods. The Synod, of course, holds both the examining boards and the presidents responsible for the persons whom they declare theologically fit, or whom they order ordained.

The subject of funeral sermons is aptly touched in the same issue, thus: "One of our pastors some time ago told me what a queer question one of his little boys once asked him, namely, 'Why do preachers lie so much, papa?' The stern reply came: 'Why, son, what do you mean? Preachers lie?' 'Now, papa, I don't mean you.' 'Well, explain yourself, son.' 'I mean all these preachers that tell so many good things about the departed and try to make the living believe that the dead has gone to heaven. And when they were here on earth, they did not talk, act, nor live as if they were on that road that leads to heaven at all.' One sometimes feels as if the above question would be a healthy one for many pastors to ask each other or themselves. A Christian deacon once asked the undersigned ("Alf. B. O."): 'What did you think of that funeral sermon?' In replying I stated: 'If funeral sermons can save, that man's soul is surely rescued for eternity.' And I shall never forget the answer this noble deacon gave, as he stated: 'This is not a joke. Just think what a comfort all those will have in this sermon who are spiritually dead, but still live on a much higher moral plane than this man lived. What will be the responsible account of such funeral sermons on the last Judgment Day?' Would to God that we had more deacons of this type to-day!" Yes, there are funerals remarkable not so much for the dead body before, as for the dead conscience in, the funeral preacher, and the question arises on such an occasion: What is it really that is being buried? And for whom are silent tears being shed?

The editor of *Augustana* writes editorially on the moral decadence of crowds of young men in our country. The Comptroller of the State of Minnesota, Swendsen, has told him that while the number of old criminals has decreased during recent years, the number of youthful criminals has been increasing at a rate that makes a thoughtful observer feel uncomfortable. All the State institutions that must take care of these young criminals are overcrowded. The hope which the Christians in our country (which?) had cherished, *viz.*, that the war and its attending distress would deepen the religious sentiments in our country, is seen to have been a hideous chimera; instead hell

seems to be holding a rich harvest. Not counting some noble exceptions, the rule seems to be — and it is observed in all churches — that those returning from overseas service or from the cantonments in our country have had the interest in religion and the Church blotted from their mind. Their irreligion infects other young men and young women in the home towns to which they have returned. The dance evil, with its attending and consequent indecencies and immoralities, is growing at an alarming rate. The editor thanks God for the Eighteenth Amendment by which we have decreased the number of old criminals. If that is the view to take of the results of our recent measure to enforce sobriety, the remedy for our young criminals presumably will be a Nineteenth Amendment. But we may deceive ourselves in regard to the fruits of prohibition. It remains to be shown that the present state of prohibition is not fostering evils as great as, and worse than, those which it purports to render impossible. If prohibition “works,” the connection between drunkenness and crime, on which much of the argument of prohibition was built up, has been overstated. We are coming to realize that there are evils greater than drunkenness, and that we are opening our front door to seven respectable-looking devils while we are casting one besotted devil out of the back door.

D.

Luther Celebration at Rome.

In its weekly edition for April 27 the *Koelnische Zeitung* prints the following:—

“Rome, April 17. (By our special reporter.) In the auditorium of the German Evangelical congregation a celebration took place yesterday in commemoration of the four-hundredth anniversary of Luther’s visit at Worms. Protestants of different nationalities participated. The superintendent of the Methodist Church in Italy, Ferreri, delivered a lengthy address, in which he gave expression both to his sympathy for Germany and his admiration for Luther. After him spoke with equal cordiality the Waldensian pastor Coisson and the Norwegian pastor Molesta. They were followed by the pastor of the congregation, Rev. Schubert, D.D., who gave a historical sketch of Luther’s stay at Worms. After Mrs. Ibsen (*née* Bjoernson), the wife of the Norwegian minister, had rendered a number of old religious folk-songs, the meeting was closed by the assembly singing Luther’s hymn.”

D.

The Commercial and the Lazy Minister.

“A Layman” in the *Lutheran Standard* (March 26) writes letters to his son who has decided to become a minister, and says, amongst other things:—

“Again, if you seek first the kingdom of God, as you expect to tell your people to do, you will have no need of earthly cares. You have the promise of the Lord that He will care for you and that you shall not suffer want. If you will cast all your cares upon your Savior, if you will trust Him in earthly things as you will in spiritual

things, you will realize that the Lord keeps His promises. It is to be feared that too many ministers at present are saying: 'What shall we eat, what shall we drink?' etc., and are longing more to see the names of their congregations upon the 'Honor Roll' than to see the names of their members written in the book of eternal life. If the ministry becomes commercialized, what will become of the people, how then can the minister preach: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God'? If the leaders of the Church do not stand as a bulwark against the great greed for money, if they will not show their people by word and act that we are living for eternity, who will do so? More than ever ministers must preach the Gospel, not only from the pulpit, but also by their life, their example, by every word and deed, and your parents want you to do so even now while you are preparing yourself for your calling.

"You also have considered that the ministry of the Gospel is a calling that calls for work, and for much hard work. In no other profession is so much required or is the work so varied. You will have to preach two and three times every Sunday, conduct Sunday-school and teachers' meetings, lead in the different societies, preside at the vestry and congregational meetings, instruct the young and the adult catechumens, call upon the sick, seek the wayward and lost, bury the dead, oversee the financial affairs, and do many other equally important things.

"It is no lazy man's calling. It is true, the minister has no one really to tell him what and when to do this or that. He, in a certain sense, is his own boss. His people often put up with him when he neglects his work. A lazy minister can slight much of his work, can neglect his duties, and his pay goes on, but his congregation must suffer, his conscience must be hushed, his people become negligent, and souls are lost. But what a reckoning on Judgment Day! What a name and reputation he receives amongst his own people and his fellow-ministers! A student who is lazy, who shuns work, who looks forward to an easy time in the ministry, should be told to look for a lazy man's job, should not be permitted to continue his studies at the seminary. My son, study the lives of Christ, of St. Paul, of Luther, of John Paton, who were men of work, of hard and continuous work.

"A leading minister who had occasion to visit many pastors said that many pastors really do not earn the salary they get, because they do not exert themselves and are negligent of their duties. Even if they are not considered lazy, they are not energetic, they are not heeding the words, 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.' Success in any other calling depends mostly upon hard work. 'Some great man has said: 'Genius is work.' Jesus Himself was very busy and said: 'I must work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.'"

Paul warned a young preacher against *philargyria* (1 Tim. 6, 10), and when he called himself and his colleagues in the ministry *hypertetai* of Christ, he used a word that means an underrower in a galley (1 Cor. 4, 1).

Intinction and the Common Cup.

The Rev. Howard K. Bartow in a recent issue of the *Living Church* (Episcopal) urged the practise of intinction, urging this mode of distributing the elements in the Lord's Supper on the ground of fear of infection. His article called forth several spirited replies. The Rev. H. S. Whitehead of the Church of the Advent (Boston) meets the challenge of Rev. Bartow, "Why will not the Church abandon the common chalice, and adopt the method of intinction?" as follows:—

"The reason why the Church has not authorized this practise is because the Church has faith in her Lord. To go a step farther, and meet on its own pragmatic ground the plea of the modernist founded on fear of infection, one may well ask, Why does not the protagonist for this change back up his plea by facts? That there is danger of infection from the common chalice is a pure assumption.

"The writer in the course of his ministry has received the remainder of the consecrated elements a very great many times after having communicated persons suffering from infectious diseases. These diseases have included smallpox, virulent tuberculosis, and other diseases even more deadly and loathsome. He has never suffered any ill effect. He has never anticipated any. He has yet to learn of any one who has suffered such effects. He submits that if there be any ground for the fear so frankly acknowledged by the persons who desire that intinction replace the traditional method for administering the Holy Communion, these grounds should be stated in the form of actual, concrete cases.

"Because a woman suffering from tuberculosis has 'thought a great deal' of these imagined perils, seems small ground for an appeal to the bishops of the Church to authorize the justification of a type of fear which has to commend it only the fact that it is typical of a certain group of modernists, not conspicuous for their faith or for the courage which rests upon faith."

A bacteriologist, in the same issue of the *Living Church*, utters this protest against a departure from the use of the common cup:—

"As a bacteriologist I must recognize the presence of bacteria on the chalice which has been touched by the lips of a communicant. They may be the organisms causing tuberculosis, pneumonia, influenza, diphtheria, sore throat, or merely non-pathogenic germs normally found in the mouth. Contact with these organisms, however, does not of necessity produce the corresponding disease. It is a known fact that one may harbor bacteria (such as those producing TB, or pneumonia), which, however, are entirely inactive for the lifetime. They may become active when bodily resistance is lowered by some cause, as exposure to dampness or cold or by prolonged strain.

"If individuals did not possess a considerable degree of resistance to infection, the world would soon be crippled with cases of tuberculosis, pneumonia, and countless other diseases. Disease-producing bacteria are met with everywhere as one goes about his daily work, breathing the germ-laden air in crowded rooms and trains, or from

contact with dusty articles and common things, as pencils and tickets touched by soiled hands. One does not, as a rule, handle money with sterile forceps; yet tubercular germs may just as easily (more probably, in fact) be present on coins and bills as on the chalice, for they have passed through the hands of hundreds of people careless in their personal habits. Having the bacteria on the hands, it is easy enough to infect mouth and nostrils. Certainly, exposure to infection comes a thousand times more frequently in the world at large than it would in the shamefully few and far-between communions made by the majority of church people." GRAEBNER.

In Defense of Dogma.

From a somewhat unexpected source, the *Personalist*, a quarterly journal of philosophy published by the University of Southern California, comes this defense of dogma (April, 1921):—

"There is at the present time a great outcry against dogma in religion. The clergyman is rare who dares announce a series of doctrinal sermons. But impatience with ancient dogmas is strangely attended by an unquenchable thirst for new and bizarre dogmas, especially if these be characterized as in any way scientific. So long as modern spiritualism put itself forth as religion, it was a joke. Adopted as a possible field of scientific research the gullible and the uncritical 'cry for it.' Nevertheless, despite the jumble of dogmas and the discredit which is thereby cast on all dogma, dogma is necessary to true religious thinking. Unless we can assume that our world is one of moral relations — of moral cause and effect — of uniformities of moral sequence — of true adaptations to each other and to the system of things, we can get on neither religiously nor morally. Theology is not the matter of indifference that is popularly supposed. There are certain fundamental presuppositions like freedom and moral accountability which are the basis of our whole social structure. Without practical belief in them the whole building would dissolve as the fabric of a dream. Certain fundamental suppositions such as justice and equal rights, though highly supposititious and debatable and never more than approximated, lie at the root of our political institutions. When those dogmas fade out of the popular faith, any political institution is doomed. So long as religion is able to maintain the distinction between goodness and wickedness, the reality of sin and of virtue and a theory of law relating thereto theologically known as judgment; so long as it can by the assumption of God set forward a reasonable system of moral relations between man and his world of associations, — so long it can build itself positively into the service of humanity. When these and other great fundamentals are gone, it becomes as weak as water, for no service it can then render can possess any meaning. With the passing of faith in religious values all political and social institutions, as well as the Church, will be at an end. The institutions of Greece were built upon a sublime spiritual consciousness voiced in her art and her great dramas. Rome owed her triumphs to the religious values of Stoicism. The Jewish prophets were the illumination of the dark

night of Israel. Just as it is impossible to weave the cloth without warp, so civilization must needs depend for its power upon the warp of widely accredited moral ideals. These ideals are necessarily dogmatic. They are to be justified as the best moral working hypothesis for life."

From most of this we dissent, on account of the implication of theological and historical judgments, which are wide of the mark. But the central idea is stated with novel force. GRAEBNER.

John Burroughs Dies an Agnostic.

The quaint patriarchal personality of John Burroughs is known to every American who takes delight in the wonders of the wilderness and its inhabitants. His writings, teeming with poetic beauty, have these many years helped busy people to get a glimpse of the enchanting life of the woods, the rivers, and the mountains. And so long as Burroughs was content to dwell in the realm for which he was fitted by his natural bent, so long he rightly enjoyed the admiration of nature lovers throughout the civilized world. But his recent writings, some of them published but a few weeks before his death, which occurred in March of the present year, have disclosed a philosophic trend which has brought grief to many of his admirers. Especially in a *North American Review* essay, *Is Nature Without Design?* and in his more recent volume, *Accepting the Universe*, he plainly denoted himself an agnostic of decided type. From the *Journal of the Missouri State Medical Association* — a somewhat unexpected source, by the way — we cull the following: —

"Such deduction from such a source causes one to halt in consternation and wonderment. Once again there has appeared the great inconsistency of a generation. One who has lived for eighty odd years in the heart of nature among the most beautiful specimens of the Master's art and should by logical deduction be among the foremost to sustain the Supreme Intellect, turns instead to the path beset with doubt and questions the existence of any such Entity." Again: "John Burroughs has missed the great point of mundane existence. The human personality is an abstruse complexity of at least two phases," — the material and spiritual, — "and Burroughs has developed one of these factors to the point where the spiritual side has dwindled to an infinitesimal minority termed agnosticism, which, in the final analysis, of course, means nothing at all.... Agnostics of all ages have exemplified to a marked extent the much ado variety of philosophy with never a tangible outcome; in fact, they are strongly suggestive of the passage in the Roman satirist's lay: '*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*'"

Burroughs's denial of spiritual experience has been well characterized by an essayist in the March issue of the *Methodist Review*: —

"Shall we say that Mr. Burroughs in the wood, watching the nut-hatch, is getting an experimental knowledge, but that Isaiah in the temple, seeing the awakening of the soul, is not getting an experimental knowledge? All things must be known according to the nature of their appeal. A sunset cannot appeal to the sense of taste, nor

the flavor of a peach to the eye. A mathematical formula makes no appeal to the conscience. One may not come to know a scientific truth by a religious experience, nor a spiritual truth by a scientific analysis. Religion has its laboratory test. It offers its proofs. It verifies its claims. It is quite as possible to explore the spiritual as it is to explore the natural. The one is as real as the other, and the twain are not divided."

It is the old story over again of the unbelieving La Place, who said that he had searched the heavens with the most powerful instruments and had failed to find God. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2, 14.

GRAEBNER.

Dearth of Ministers.

From the *Moody Monthly*, April issue, we reprint the following words which speak of the deplorable condition of the Church of our day:—

Oberlin University, which has been a source of supply for Congregational ministers, did not report a single member of its graduating class of last year as being headed towards a theological seminary. In Yale, Princeton, and Chicago universities the decline runs from 20 to 42 per cent. At Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and other Methodist colleges, conditions for the past ten years show no improvement. In 1916 the Protestant Episcopal Church had 692 "postulants," as they are called, but at present the number is about one-half.

These statistics are gathered from the *Boston Evening Transcript*, and, in my judgment, are not satisfactorily explained by the limitation of ministers' salaries; for "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink."

And this is not all of it; for while the supply is diminishing, the demand is increasing. Newell Dwight Hillis is quoted in the *Baptist Temple News* as saying that 25,000 preachers, or one-sixth of the whole number in Protestantism, have withdrawn, or are in the process of withdrawing, from the ministry to enter educational or reform movements.

Of thousands of theological students or young ministers who went to the front during the war, only a small proportion on their return made their way back to the college, the seminary, or the pastorate.

Why is the Gospel-ministry thus losing its attraction and power to hold men? Is there any adequate answer except the present decline in faith, the apostasy in Christendom which the holy prophets foretold, and about which some religious editors of the modern school affect a sneer?

As a West Virginia pastor, in his little church-paper, pertinently inquires (Rev. W. S. Bradshaw, of Logan): "If God is little more than a noble idea, if Jesus Christ is not Deity, if the Bible is not the final word of authority, if man is not hopelessly lost in sin, if

the Cross is not the only means of salvation, if salvation is not wholly of grace, if the Church's business is to patch up a wrecked world, then what message has the preacher that is worth the sacrifice he is called upon to make?"

FRTZ.

The Reason for a Scarcity of Ministers in Congregational Churches.

The *Congregationalist* complains of a scarcity of ministers in the *Congregational denomination*. It says that the recruiting of men for the ministry is the most important matter that will come before the Congregational National Council at Los Angeles in July. On page 477 the *Congregationalist* says that "the most obvious cause of a devitalized ministry is inadequate support." But the real reason is given on page 491. There are given the advertisements of a number of theological institutions, evidently for the purpose of inducing young men to train for the ministry. And what have these to offer? "Interdenominational faculty and student-body." "Interdenominational in its student constituency; undenominational in its chief courses." "Interdenominational." "Undenominational training for the ministry, foreign missions, religious education, social service."

"Interdenominational" and "undenominational" stand for a lack of conviction, of a positive theology, of a definite divine message to a sinful world as to the great issues of life and death, of time and eternity.

Why, then, should young men enter a ministry which has nothing better to offer? A church which, when preaching its doctrines to the world, cannot say, "Thus says the Lord," needs no ministers. In matters pertaining to our salvation we are not helped by hearing what Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones have to say, for they know no more about those things than we do. Because those things are not found in *natural* religion, we must look for them in *revealed* religion. But revealed religion has been given by God through Moses and the prophets, and through the evangelists and the apostles, and we fail to see where God has indicated that before the end of days He would send others to supersede them. There was nothing "undenominational" about Paul when he said: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

The lack of such positive conviction as to the truth of God and of such positive preaching in many pulpits of our day is the ruin of the Church, and the "interdenominational" and "undenominational" theological seminaries, both here and abroad, are primarily responsible. Young men are acting more wisely than they know when they keep away from them.

FRTZ.

Back to Calvary.

Very aptly the *Biblical Review* (January, 1921) remarks: "In the presence of a desperate malady no one thinks of experimenting, if a tried and potent remedy is known. Yet, in times like these, all sorts of political, social, and religious nostrums are being offered to the individual and the nations. If men had nothing better to turn

to, it might be worth while to try these human plans, but our Lord Himself has and is the supreme source of healing and of life for a sadly troubled world. It is refreshing to find this fact proclaimed in such a wholesome, clear way as is done by J. Marvin Nicols, in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, when he calls to his brother preachers:

“Oh, what an hour this is for the man who has not lost his commission to preach a risen Lord! What a supreme moment, this, in human history when a Christ can be preached—a Christ who, remembering that we are but dust, can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities! On this very mountain-peak of history there is no place for a preacher who moves in the fog belt, no place for the preacher whose head is not above the clouds. Bruce Wright recalls the fact that Martin Luther preached this doctrine of atoning blood to slumbering Europe, and Europe awoke from the dead. Amid all his defenses of divine sovereignty, Calvin never belittled or ignored the atonement. Spurgeon thundered this glorious doctrine of Christ crucified into the ears of peasant and peer alike. John Bunyan made the Cross the starting-point to the celestial city. Moody’s bells all chimed to the keynote of Calvary.

“O brother preacher, let us put our ears close to the world’s great big heart! It murmurs and sighs like a tired and restless sea. It is a weary world, and longs for rest. Let us quit piddling with things that, in view of eternal things and the ages to come, are but stones that jeer and mock the famished soul. Preach Jesus!—the name that charms our fears, that bids our sorrows cease. Tell them He breaks the power of canceled sin, He sets the prisoner free. They can understand a message like that. Preach Jesus! For when He speaks, new life the dead receive; and, listening to the music of His voice, the mournful, broken hearts rejoice.

“Let us go back to the Christ of the Ages—back to the very shadow of the Cross. Back to Calvary—the world’s final hope; that’s the supreme call of the hour! No man can have evangelistic success who fails to preach redemption through His atoning blood.”

MUELLER.

A Plea for the Study of Greek.

In a recent issue of the *Presbyterian* the Rev. T. S. Armentraut makes a vigorous plea for the restoration of the study of Greek to its rightful place in higher education. We quote in parts:—

“By the perfection of its verbal inflexion, by its incomparable and excessive use of the particles, and by its careful accentuation, the Greek language was unrivaled for the expression of nice and varied shades of meaning with precision and power. As a medium for expressing great and vital thought it is, by its beauty, richness, and completeness of expression, and by its symmetry, without doubt, unsurpassed. In the wise providence of God it was chosen to reveal and convey in permanent form ‘the great mystery of godliness’ to mankind. The Greek New Testament is the greatest book that has been produced in the history of the world. Its contents are the most important, and they are clothed in the most exact and perfect language ever developed

by man. Is it, then, not a matter of deep regret that but few of the graduates of our schools and colleges are able to read, in the language in which they were written, the gospels and epistles of the New Testament?

"Is it not a matter of vital concern, not only to the Church, but to men in general, that the youth now passing through school, college, and university are being cheated out of the richest product of the human mind and the highest type of educational training and culture, as well as being deprived of the knowledge necessary to rightly understand the mind of Christ as revealed by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament?

"And furthermore, is there not a close connection between the omission of Latin and Greek from the curricula of our institutions of learning and the scarcity of candidates for the ministry of the Gospel? The call to the ministry comes to many young men when they are well along in their college course, or even after they have graduated. Having studied no Greek, therefore, and little Latin, when the demands of the ministry make an appeal, it is apt to be turned aside with the thought it would take too much time and labor now to acquire the necessary training in the languages to prepare one for that holy calling.

"It will be a sorry day for our Church when her ministers can no longer read with facility, and therefore with delight, God's Holy Word in the languages in which it was at the first delivered to mankind; for no translation can convey the full and varied shades of meaning that are stored up for the classical scholar in the original tongues."

GRAEBNER.

BOOK REVIEW.

Christian Art in the Place and in the Form of Lutheran Worship.

By *Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., B. D.* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1921. 415 pages, 6×9¼. Profusely illustrated. Bound in full cloth. Price, \$3.50.

For all the great variety of topics treated in this volume of Dr. Kretzmann's a nice balance between its component parts is maintained. This to us is the best proof of the author's mastery of his subject. The book treats "The History of Church Architecture and Ecclesiastical Art," "The Lutheran Church Building and Its Appointments," "Liturgies," "Hymnology," "The Festivals," "The Lutheran Service," and under these general heads such details as the catacombs, Ivan the Terrible's Cathedral, California missions, Gloria Dei Church of Philadelphia, medieval stained glass, Christian symbolisms, resting-rooms for women, the treatment of the altar. Lecterns (we thank the author for spelling this word l-e-c-t-e-r-n), how to choose colored windows, the vestments, gowns, the various parts of the liturgy, and countless other subjects are treated,—and yet these many details properly unify into chapters, and the chapters organically grow into two books, and the two books by an inner necessity grow into one,—**"Christian Art in the Place and in the Form of Lutheran Worship."**

Dr. Kretzmann has deposited in this work a very considerable erudi-

tion. He quotes from works as far apart as Fergusson's great *History of Architecture*, Ruskin's *Stones of Venice*, Stoddard's *Lectures*, *Lehre und Wehre*, Lake's *Apostolic Fathers*, and Lochner, *Hauptgottesdienst*. But this mass of source material is skilfully woven into continuous narrative or description, as the case may be. The book makes delightful reading. It is adorned with many pertinent and beautiful illustrations, is printed on good paper, well bound, an elegant book in every way. The index is not satisfactory, but, then, who has ever seen a satisfactory index?

GRAEBNER.

The Lost Note in Much of the Present-Day Preaching. *David H. Bauslin.* Commencement Address, Philadelphia Seminary, 1920. Issued in pamphlet form.

We have read voluminous books and laid them aside in disgust, because they contained little or nothing that was worth while; and we have read brief addresses, lectures, or essays which contained much that was good and filled our heart with delight. The commencement address by Dr. Bauslin belongs to the latter class. Dr. Bauslin makes a plea for *doctrinal* preaching as the only kind of preaching that is commanded, that is needed, that will keep the Church right, that will save souls, and that will insure an audience for the preacher.

"In anxious efforts to make the pulpit fit into the times, it has been transformed into a school of sociology with Jesus Christ left out or into a forum for the discussion of what are alleged to be living and up-to-date current questions." After this arraignment of the modern pulpit, Dr. Bauslin says: "You are never going to get the ethics of Jesus from men who reject the theology of Jesus. . . . The personality of God, the deity of our Lord, the atonement by the cross, the regenerated life implied in the use of Word and Sacrament, life beyond the grave—these and the related doctrines of grace must be restored to their rightful place in our preaching if the truth and grace of the Gospel are to dominate the hearts of the people, and if good works are to be manifest in their lives. . . . The vast public ignorance of Christian doctrine and history are among the most deplorable and ominous dangers among us. . . . It is not believing on Christ as I have conceived Him, . . . but rather believing on the Christ that is set before me in the Gospel, that saves men."

The commencement speaker directs himself against the superficial preaching of the "men in the ministry who are too mentally indifferent to think hard and long" when he says: "In our sermons we must, at least at intervals, get below the surface and deal greatly with great realities."

The *ceterum censeo* of the speaker addressing a class of ministerial graduates is: Preach doctrine! "The preaching, then, I take it, for the religious conflicts of the day will consist in a revival of doctrinal preaching. . . . There is need of a stiff evangelical interpretation of the Gospel which shall meet the real needs of man's nature. The age needs pre-eminently in its pulpits preachers, not lecturers; a Gospel, and not a philosophy; a message from heaven, and not a theme earth-evolved; a real message of hope and glad tidings of no dubious sound." Quoting Phillips Brooks, he says: "No preaching ever had any strong power that was not the preaching of doctrine. The preachers that have moved and held men have always preached doctrine. . . . Preach doctrine, preach all the doc-

trine that you know, and learn forever more and more; but preach it always, not that men may believe it, but that men may be saved by believing it."

Doctrine has long ago been the "lost note" in the preaching from sectarian pulpits. That our Lutheran pastors are still preaching doctrine is due to a large measure of grace which God has given us. But the warning of Paul, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall," is applicable also here. The tendency of the time is to rob us of doctrinal preaching and thorough doctrinal instruction of our catechumens, both children and adults. Our strenuous life, the multiplicity of a pastor's duties, overorganization in the Church, the frequent requests made to preach on a great variety of topics, the insistent demands of a "practical age," indifference finding its expression in the union movements in the Church: all these things are temptations to neglect doctrinal preaching and instruction. The study of the Scriptures in the original Greek and Hebrew, of the Book of Concord, of Luther, and of sound theological books needs to be much encouraged.

FRITZ.

Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—

1. **The Devotional Life of the Church Worker.** *Walter E. Schuette.* 92 pages. 45 cts.

This booklet treats of the inner, devotional life of a church-worker, hidden in Christ, as the prerequisite of every really successful effort in the Lord's field. Over against an over-busy, Martha-like, often mechanical activity, it urges the contemplative Mary-like devotional spirit, evinced in heartfelt prayer, earnest study of God's Word, devout song, in short, in constant true communion with God through Jesus Christ, as the dynamic force and guiding principle of what a Christian does on behalf of Christ. On page 41 the writer says: "Bear in mind that church-work essentially is not systematic, business-like execution of certain methods in external affairs, but the edification of the body of Christ, the true upbuilding of the spiritual life of the members of the congregation." Thus the message is good, and the appeal timely. By way of criticism we may add that the introductory chapter is rather misleading, almost irrelevant, and we regret that no greater stress is laid upon faith as the true foundation and source of all Christian devotional life. Though faith is everywhere implied and taken for granted, yet there ought to be an entire chapter showing how devotional life is after all nothing else but a strong, true, living faith exerting itself in the various activities of a child of God. MUELLER.

2. **The Lord's Prayer.** Sermons on the Catechism, Vol. III. *Robert Emory Golladay, D. D.,* pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Columbus, O. X and 457 pages. \$2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Reverend Golladay is the author of several well-received volumes of sermons on Luther's Catechism. His *Lenten Outlines and Sermons*, *The Ten Commandments*, and *The Apostles' Creed* are favorably known in Lutheran circles. In the present volume, *The Lord's Prayer*, he treats a most vital subject, the model prayer bequeathed to us by our Lord. The book contains 32 sermons written in vivid, sparkling style, and setting forth the sound doctrines of Scriptural truth on prayer in a spirit that

marks the writer's own faith, piety, and devotion. All in all, the collection of sermons may well serve as a guide to busy pastors, and as a book of real instruction to interested laymen. Several errors have crept into the print which ought to be corrected in future editions; and here and there a word or expression might be altered to good advantage. MUELLER.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany: —

1. **Luther-Brevier.** Von Gottesfurcht und Gottvertrauen. Betrachtungen Martin. Luthers, herausgegeben von *Emanuel Hirsch*. 76 pages. 10 cts. plus export duty, etc.

Sixty-six brief, pithy, stirring, illuminating selections from Luther's writings, mostly from the pre-Wartburg period, are here offered for use in private or family devotion. All of them are full of doctrine and comfort; not a few of them are gems of Christian thought. The little brochure was published during the war, in 1917, and ranks among the best that has come from the religious press of Germany during the years of Germany's great sorrow.

2. **Monatsschrift fuer Pastoraltheologie zur Vertiefung des gesamten pfarramtlichen Wirkens, neu begruendet von Dr. H. A. Koestlin; herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Wurster und Dr. Jacob Schoell.** 17. Jahrg., Heft 1—5, Oktober 1920—Februar 1921. 50 cts. for six months.

The pastorate that is to be served by this publication is in spirit and form different from that which we know in the American Lutheran Church. The contents of the publication are interesting enough, but can afford hardly any stimulation or help to our pastors.

Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago: —

- Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der ev.-luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. St.** Gesammelt von *Geo. J. Fritschel*, D. D. 9. Lieferung. 35 cts.

With honest regret the historians of the Lutheran Church of America will learn that the series of source materials which Dr. Fritschel began to publish a number of years ago, is terminated with this issue.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.: —

- My Church.** Vol. VI. Edited by *Ira O. Nothstein*. 132 pages. 40 cts.

The present volume of this illustrated Lutheran manual, "pertaining principally to the history, work, and spirit of the Augustana Synod," will be appreciated in circles outside of the Swedish Synod, chiefly because of the contributions "The Spirit of the Fathers," by Dr. J. Telleen, "Pastor Jonas Swensson," by Dr. Nils Forsander, and "Jenny Lind." The last article, "The Lutheran Church of the World" is an adaptation from Luecke's "The Distinctive Characteristics of the Lutheran Church."

Ernst Mussgang, Publ., 323 Cedar St., St. Paul, Minn.: —

- The Truth about the so-called "Luther's Testament in English."** Tyndale's New Testament. *L. Franklin Gruber*. 71 pages.

In view of British spleen that has been manifested even in the investigation of historical facts, this study which shows the measure of Luther's help to Tyndale is a satisfaction and delight to the Lutheran student of the English Bible.